



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/700,513	11/05/2003	Takatoshi Okagawa	244925US90	5918
22850	7590	09/11/2008		
OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C. 1940 DUKE STREET ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314				
EXAMINER				
ADHAMI MOHAMMAD SAJD				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2616				
NOTIFICATION DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
09/11/2008		ELECTRONIC		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patentdoCKET@oblon.com  
oblonpat@oblon.com  
jgardner@oblon.com

# Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

10/700,513

**Applicant(s)**

OKAGAWA ET AL.

**Examiner**

MOHAMMAD S. ADHAMI

**Art Unit**

2616

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 June 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-946)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SI/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

**DETAILED ACTION**

- Applicant's RCE filed 6/30/2008 is acknowledged.
- Claims 1-4 have been amended.
- Claims 1-4 are pending.
- Applicant's response and amendment with respect to the rejection of claims 1-4 under 35 USC 112 2nd paragraph is noted and the rejection is withdrawn.

***Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114***

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 6/30/2008 has been entered.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

1. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:  

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
2. Claims 1-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In claims 1-4, the limitations *a source router connected by a source mobile station and a specific router and a destination router connected by a destination mobile station* are confusing. What is a source router connected to by a source mobile station? Are a specific router and a destination router connected by a destination mobile station?

Claim 1 recites the limitation "the request from the routing controller" in line 24. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 2 recites the limitation "the trigger receiver" in line 9. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 3 recites the limitation "the received data" in line 18. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

In claim 4, the limitation *the specific router determined the router controller* is confusing.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2. Claims 1-4 (as best understood) are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Neves (US App. 2006/0276209).

**Re claims 1 and 2:**

Neves discloses *receiving a predetermined trigger* (Para.[022] “an efficient and incremental handoff processing technique is defined” - where handoff is a predetermined trigger).

Neves further discloses *a router controller determining a specific router based on topology information and a routing path of data addressed to a destination mobile station when the predetermined trigger is received* (Para.[0080] the routing coordinator adds a new FAM record – where the routing coordinator does this after determining the FAM can be used and Para.[0050] roaming coordinator enables HAM and FAM connectivity and discovery, as well as connection migration (i.e. handoff) where the trigger is handoff).

Neves further discloses *requesting a specific router to provide address information routed to the specific router* (Fig.3 ref.340 – where the FAM is a specific router and an address is requested from it and Para.[0076] the FAM receives address information and Para.[0067 and Para 0089]).

Neves further discloses *requesting the source router to create information to convert a destination address to the routed address* (Fig.3 ref.310 where the translation record is created and Para.[0082 and 0089]).

Neves further discloses *requesting the specific router to create information to convert the provided address to the routed address* (Fig.3 ref.340 - where the translation record is created and Para.[0082 and 0089]).

Neves further discloses *a specific router providing the routed address* (Para.[0078] the address is communicated to the routing coordinator).

Neves further discloses *a specific router creating and managing the address information and converting the address* (Fig.3 ref.340 - where an entry in the memory is created and used to convert the address and Para.[0067]).

Neves further discloses *a source router creating and managing the address information and converting the address* (Fig.3 ref.310 - where an entry in the memory is created and used to convert the address and Para.[0066]).

Neves further discloses *routing based on the converted address* (Para.[0003] the present invention relates to methods, systems, and computer program instructions for routing packets).

**Re claims 3 and 4:**

Neves discloses *receiving a predetermined trigger* (Para.[022] "an efficient and incremental handoff processing technique is defined" - where handoff is a predetermined trigger).

Neves further discloses *a router controller determining a specific router based on topology information and a routing path of data addressed to a destination mobile station when the predetermined trigger is received* (Para.[0080] the routing coordinator adds a new FAM record – where the routing

coordinator does this after determining the FAM can be used and Para.[0050] roaming coordinator enables HAM and FAM connectivity and discovery, as well as connection migration (i.e. handoff) where the trigger is handoff).

Neves further discloses *requesting a specific router to provide address information routed to the specific router* (Fig.3 ref.340 – where the FAM is a specific router and an address is requested from it and Para.[0076] the FAM receives address information and Para.[0067 and 0089]).

Neves further discloses *requesting the source router to create information to convert a destination address to the routed address* (Fig.3 ref.310 where the translation record is created and Para.[0066,0082 and 0089]).

Neves further discloses *requesting the specific router to create information to convert the provided address to the routed address* (Fig.3 ref.340 - where the translation record is created and Para.[0067, 0082 and 0089]).

### ***Response to Arguments***

3. Applicant's arguments filed 6/30/2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In the remarks, Applicant contends Neves does not disclose changing a routing path of data addressed to the destination mobile station in accordance with a trigger.

The Examiner respectfully disagrees. Neves does disclose changing a routing path of data addressed to the destination mobile station in accordance

with a trigger (Para.[0080 the routing coordinator adds a new FAM record – where the routing coordinator does this after determining the FAM can be used and Para.[0050 roaming coordinator enables HAM and FAM connectivity and discovery, as well as connection migration (i.e. handoff) where the trigger is handoff). The routing path is changed to include the FAM. The trigger is handoff.

In the remarks, Applicant contends Neves does not disclose a source router creating second address conversion information for converting a destination address to an address provided to the specific router.

The Examiner respectfully disagrees. Neves does disclose a source router creating second address conversion information for converting a destination address to an address provided to the specific router (Fig.3 ref.310 - where an entry in the memory is created and used to convert the address). The entry in memory converts one address to another.

### ***Conclusion***

4. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. O'Neill (US 7,366,147) and Brendel (US 6,182,139) show converting address.



Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to MOHAMMAD S. ADHAMI whose telephone number is (571)272-8615. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 8-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Firmin Backer can be reached on (571)272-6703. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/M. S. A./  
Examiner, Art Unit 2616

/FIRMIN BACKER/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2616